

State of California
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
June 4, 2015

Caltrans Headquarters
Caltrans Board Room
1120 N Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Committee Members in Attendance:

Hamid Bahadori, Chairman
Mark Greenwood, Vice Chairman
John Ciccarelli
Chuck Gunter
Bryan Jones
Rick Marshall
Emma Olenberger
Devinder Singh, Committee Secretary
Duper Tong
Jay Walter
William Winter

Alternate Committee Members in Attendance:

Bob Bronkall
Daniel Anthony Gutierrez
Rock Miller

Caltrans Staff – Sacramento Headquarters:

Johnny Bhullar, Legal Liaison, Office of Engineering Support
Chris Engelmann, Traffic Engineer, Office of Traffic Engineering
Don Howe, Chief, Signs Branch, Office of Traffic Engineering

Caltrans Staff:

Theresa Drum, Safety Liaison, Division of Maintenance
Don Rushton, Branch Chief of Traffic Operations, Caltrans District 3
Beth Thomas, Branch Chief, Pedestrian/Bicycle Planning Coordination

Also Present:

Jim Baross, California Bicycle Advisory Committee
Hector Barron, City of Sacramento

Kevin Korth, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration
Scott Lanphier, County of Colusa
Jill LaVine, Registrar of Voters, County of Sacramento – Voter Registration and Elections
Alejandro “Alex” Padilla, California Secretary of State
Daryl Pride, Associate Engineer, Colusa County
Mindy Romero, Ph.D., California Civic Engagement Project, UC Davis – Center for Regional
Change
Massoud Saberian, City of Santa Rosa

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chairman Hamid Bahadori called the meeting of the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC or Committee) to order at 9:01 a.m. Don Howe reviewed the meeting protocols.

Chair Bahadori invited the CTCDC members and audience to introduce themselves.

2. Approval of Minutes of the March 5, 2015, Meeting

MOTION: Committee Member Marshall moved to approve the March 5, 2015, California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as presented.
Vice Chair Greenwood seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Membership

a. John Ciccarelli

Committee Secretary Singh stated non-motorized Committee Member John Ciccarelli will be leaving the CTCDC, and Alternate Committee Member Daniel Anthony Gutierrez will move into that Voting Member position. The CTCDC is now accepting résumés for the non-motorized Alternate Committee Member position.

b. Michael Kenney

Committee Secretary Singh stated Alternate Committee Member Michael Kenney has left the CTCDC. His replacement was not in attendance.

c. Lt. David Ricks

Committee Secretary Singh stated CHP David Ricks will be leaving the CTCDC, and CHP Scott Baland will move into the Alternate Committee Member position.

Chair Bahadori welcomed the new Committee Members and thanked Committee Members who are leaving for their years of service. He asked staff to prepare plaques to present to the Committee Members in honor of their service at the next Committee meeting.

4. Comments from the Public on Issues Not on This Agenda

Kevin Korth, of the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), compared 12 CVC 21401, which governs local and state agencies, and paragraph 13 of Section 2A.06 of the national Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and stated they are sections that are often brought before this Committee in experiments and agenda item proposals.

AGENDA ITEMS

5. Public Hearing

CONSENT ITEMS (minor discussion with vote expected)

There were no Consent Items discussed at this time.

INFORMATION ITEMS (new items that may be voted on or brought back as an Action Item in a future meeting)

Agenda Item 15-10: “EMERGENCY SCENE AHEAD” (W90(CA)) Sign Proposal

Theresa Drum, the Safety Liaison for the Caltrans Division of Maintenance, stated Caltrans is requesting an “EMERGENCY SCENE AHEAD” word message warning sign to replace the now-depleted “ACCIDENT AHEAD” signs. She provided an overview of the background, objectives, support, options, standard, and guidance for the proposal to add language in the CA MUTCD, Chapter 6I, Section 6I.102(CA) for an “EMERGENCY SCENE AHEAD” W90(CA) word message warning sign.

Committee Member Questions:

Committee Member Marshall asked if the FHWA was in support of this proposal. Ms. Drum stated Caltrans received supportive correspondence from Mr. Korth a few weeks ago.

Committee Member Marshall stated the PowerPoint slide indicates the sign should be deployed at locations where a downstream traffic queue has formed. He stated it should be where an upstream traffic queue has formed. Ms. Drum agreed.

Committee Member Walter stated the new color should be noted somewhere to avoid confusion. Chair Bahadori agreed and gave the example that the pink sign appeared purple on the PowerPoint slide.

Ms. Drum stated the FHWA has encouraged the use of this sign as an official incident management sign with the fluorescent pink color to distinguish it from regular construction or maintenance zones. She agreed that the sign color should be noted in statute.

Chair Bahadori asked if the fluorescent pink color will be standardized throughout the industry. Ms. Drum stated it is a standardized color.

Committee Member Ciccarelli suggested looking at other instances of the use of fluorescent pink signs for language consistency.

Committee Secretary Singh stated the fluorescent pink color signs are covered in CA MUTCD, Part 6, Incident Signs.

Johnny Bhullar, the Legal Liaison of the Caltrans Office of Engineering Support, stated the optional fluorescent pink color began with the 2003 MUTCD as a way to distinguish between reaction to a planned event versus an unplanned event in a work zone.

Public Comment:

Mr. Korth stated no official memo was sent from the FHWA, but the language does appear in the FHWA Traffic Incident Management (TIM) Handbook.

Committee Member Winter asked if it will be incorporated in the next update of the federal MUTCD. Mr. Korth stated “EMERGENCY SCENE AHEAD” signs would likely be added to the TIM Handbook, if it was proposed at that time.

Committee Member Marshall asked Mr. Korth if he was comfortable with the proposed language of the support statement recommended today. Mr. Korth stated he was.

Committee Member Discussion:

Committee Member Walter asked about the possibility of mounting the signs on the back of Caltrans vehicles to increase their utility. Ms. Drum agreed with having versatile options. She stated she is not aware that signs of this dimension can be mounted on the backs of vehicles, but it is something that can be explored. Having access to portable, changeable message signs (CMS) also adds to the versatility.

Committee Member Marshall moved approval of this item with amendments to the proposed language: Add “vehicles, or displayed on changeable message signs” between “temporary sign holders” and “not on barricades,” in the Standard language, and change “downstream” to “upstream” in the Guidance language.

MOTION: Committee Member Marshall moved approval of the addition of the proposed text in the CA MUTCD, Chapter 6I.102(CA), as amended. Committee Member Tong seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item 15-11: Proposed Near-Term Revisions to Existing CA MUTCD Guidance on Bicycle Signals

Committee Member Ciccarelli provided an overview of the background and history of bicycle signal faces in California, compared today’s proposal to a previous proposal, Item 14-05, and described the complexities of combining separate bicycle lanes with pedestrian hybrid beacons and scramble phases.

California put bicycle signal content into the MUTCD early on. More recently, the FHWA and Caltrans, responding to the evolution of bikeway signage, initiated Class IV separated bike lanes. Partially- or fully-separated facilities within the street/curb line are in use in several cities in California. There is a need for something like a bicycle signal because bicycles do not meet signal warrants for motor vehicles. This proposal seeks blanket approval from the FHWA for optional use of bicycle signal faces in California under the provisions in IA-16.

Committee Member Ciccarelli noted that one minor wording change in Recommendation A to the Interim Approval 16 language in the current CA MUTCD is that the warrants conditions in the CA MUTCD apply to new installations of bicycle signals.

The FHWA Interim Approval 16 mandates that a bicycle signal sign will be required, even if the bicycle signal face has all the signal symbol indications, and no exclusive bicycle face is required for applying the signal phase, only a protected phase, which gives a lot more design flexibility. Applications that will continue to require experimentation are those used with pedestrian hybrid beacons, shared lane approaches, and bicycle scramble phases.

Committee Member Ciccarelli suggested a qualification of the language in Recommendation B, Warrant 10, Bicycle Volume, which must allow for expanded volume in the case of a location that does not yet have a way for bicycles to cross.

The proposal, if approved, will be appropriated into a CA MUTCD update in early 2016, which gives a two-year lead on the 2018 CA MUTCD that would come from the Notice of Proposed Amendment at the federal level.

Committee Member Ciccarelli stated the proposed recommendations in the agenda are to make a recommendation that Caltrans apply to the FHWA for blanket approval under IA-16, to delete the existing warrant language from the CA MUTCD, and to discuss the proposed new warrant to be brought back in the next CTCDC meeting.

Committee Member Questions:

Committee Member Winter referenced Warrant 10, Bicycle Volume, on page 21 of the meeting packet, and asked if collision and geometric will be included in the edit of the manual. Warrants 1 through 9 include a narrative in 4C.01 that gives an introduction to the warrants and notes that at least two would have to be met. He asked if a narrative will be added to 4C.01 to describe the relationship between each of the warrants with the suggested Warrant 10. The FHWA notice indicated it was not the intent that the interim approval would include a warrant for new signals. He stated the need for consistency in the language between “public works official” in 4C.102 and “engineer” cited elsewhere in the manual. He asked how decisions are made about the weighing of each of the warrants and evaluating the need for new traffic signals.

Public Comment:

Jim Baross, Co-Chair of the California Bicycle Advisory Committee (CBAC) for Caltrans, requested the opportunity to review agendaized bicycle items before CTCDC meetings. He spoke in personal support of the recommendations and stated he will bring them before the CBAC for their input. He stated the bicycle signals in Davis control all movements of bicyclists, no matter where they are in the intersections. The recommendation is to allow for the bicycle signal head to control movements in a bikeway, not just bicyclists. There is confusion, especially among traffic enforcement personnel, about cyclists in the regular shared lane or left turn lane that should not be controlled by the signal head that controls movements in the bikeway.

Committee Member Discussion:

Beth Thomas, the Branch Chief of Caltrans District 4, Pedestrian/Bicycle Planning and Coordination, clarified that the warrants are only for new traffic signal installations, with or without a bike signal face, analogous to adding a pedestrian signal head at an already signalized intersection. Warrants do not have to be met to do that; the situation is just being corrected.

Committee Member Marshall suggested amending Warrant 7 to consider bicycle/vehicle collision history.

Committee Member Tong stated the Signal Committee has not reviewed the additional warrant for the signal. He suggested splitting Recommendations A and B for Committee Member discussion.

Committee Secretary Singh agreed with the goals of obtaining Committee recommendation on the blanket approval today so agencies can use the existing language in the CA MUTCD, and

having Committee Member discussion on the proposed warrant to bring back in the next meeting.

Committee Member Ciccarelli agreed with splitting the motion into two parts. He asked if there were any potential restrictive warrants, even with interim approval, given the existing language in the MUTCD. Ms. Thomas stated the proposal for the blanket approval would include deleting the existing contradictory bicycle signal language in the CA MUTCD at the next update.

Committee Member Ciccarelli asked Committee Member Tong if he feels the Caltrans district engineers will be comfortable to sign off or be reluctant to proceed based on the CTCDC's request for interim approval without the warrant obligation. Committee Member Tong suggested not changing the language, because the Signal Committee has yet to fully vet this issue and bring back recommendations to the CTCDC. He stated staff is looking for blanket approval so local agencies can use it.

Alternate Committee Member Gutierrez asked if a bicyclist must obey the regulatory bicycle sign when in a through-travel lane or left turn lane. Committee Member Ciccarelli stated the FHWA has issued interim approval.

Alternate Committee Member Miller stated the concern that there are bicycle signal face installations statewide that will no longer be compliant when existing language is deleted and that the change will interfere with the pedestrian signal in many existing applications.

Committee Member Walter agreed but stated the interim approval will make every agency responsible to look at their installations in those locations to ensure that they would be in compliance with the new bicycle signal face sign. It may be a good opportunity to publicize this so all agencies will be in compliance.

Alternate Committee Member Miller stated some installations may require traffic signal modification. He suggested allowing an appropriate amount of time for compliance.

Public Comment:

Mr. Korth suggested the use of a compliance date table to encourage agencies to meet requirements by the compliance date. He stated there is no compliance date listed for this interim approval, such as when the existing language in blue will be deleted. When a compliance date is not attached, agencies can still follow the previous manual until modifications to their intersections need to be made.

MOTION for Recommendation A: Committee Member Ciccarelli moved to approve a recommendation to Caltrans to seek statewide blanket approval for Optional Use of Bicycle Signal Faces based on federal Interim Approval 16 (1A-16) for all agencies in California. This would include approval for Caltrans to delete the existing bicycle signal guidance and standards from the California MUTCD, which conflict with IA-16. Committee Member Tong seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Committee Member Ciccarelli stated the name of the warrant is Bicycle Volume, but it has sub-conditions for volume, collision history, and geometrics. He suggested a separate warrant called Bicycle Conditions.

Chair Bahadori stated he agreed with a previous comment that accidents do not belong here but should be under Warrant 7.

Committee Member Ciccarelli agreed with Mr. Winter that Warrant 7 already addresses collision. He suggested that Caltrans look beyond just edits to Warrant 10 as proposed, to the general warrant structure in the traffic and signals section.

MOTION for Recommendation B: Committee Member Ciccarelli moved to adopt a proposed new warrant for traffic control signals based on a combination of bicycle volume and collision history, or bicycle volume and geometric conditions. Committee Member Marshall seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS (continuing discussion from prior meetings with vote expected)

There were no Action Items discussed at this time.

6. Request for Experimentation

Agenda Item 15-12: Evaluation of Traffic Calming Treatments in Princeton, CA

Scott Lanphier, the Director of Public Works for the county of Colusa, provided an overview of the demographics of Colusa County, the purpose of the request, the history of the speed problems in the town of Princeton, the research of other county solutions nationwide, and the innovative solution presented today – optical speed bars, the combination of chevrons and lateral bars, which are striping patterns that provide a relatively safe method of modifying a driver's perception as they come into a community.

Chair Bahadori thanked Mr. Lanphier for his thorough, well-prepared application for experimentation. He suggested that Mr. Lanphier's application be used as a model for others.

Committee Member Winter agreed and stated Mr. Lanphier presented a valuable solution that should be shared with other rural counties. He stated his department would be interested in the outcomes of this experiment.

Committee Member Marshall agreed. He asked if phasing the installation had been considered to test if only one type of optical speed bar or a combination of the two increases the effectiveness. Mr. Lanphier stated phasing it in would possibly extend the amount of time it would take to get any results. If the desire of the Committee is to get more data that would separate whether or not lateral bars or chevrons are effective independently or together, additional studies could be done in other locations throughout the county.

Committee Member Marshall asked why paint is not used instead of thermoplastic, since it is an experiment. Mr. Lanphier stated thermoplastic striping has an impact on reflectivity that paint does not.

Committee Member Ciccarelli spoke in support of the experiment. He suggested an effective way to slow traffic entering a rural town is with a deflection gateway. He stated his appreciation for Mr. Lanphier's willingness to tease the experiment apart into separate factors on other sites within the county to test the outcomes.

Mr. Lanphier agreed and stated a deflection gateway is being considered as part of the project but may be cost-prohibitive.

Committee Member Jones commended Mr. Lanphier and Caltrans for working together to identify creative and innovative solutions. There is a need for more cost-effective tools that can be quickly implemented in communities.

Committee Member Walter spoke in support of the request for experimentation. He suggested using paint for the experiment because it is easier to remove and less of an initial investment.

Committee Member Tong spoke in support of the signing and striping to help speed reduction. He suggested that changing the roadway geometry is a key element to control speed.

Don Rushton, the Branch Chief for Caltrans Traffic Operations for this project, commended Colusa County for offering to work with Caltrans on this issue. He suggested implementing it all at once rather than phasing it in because the increased speed limit has been held off for close to a year. He stated a problem with deflection is the large farm equipment that runs through town and takes up both lanes.

Chair Bahadori asked if there was an opportunity to do this experiment in three variations to see which, if any, of the optical speed bars are more effective: one with the chevrons, one with the lateral bars, and one with a combination of the two. Mr. Lanphier stated he could experiment in separate locations, but probably not immediately. He suggested continuing the experiment in other locations once the effectiveness was verified in the initial location.

MOTION: Committee Member Marshall moved to approve the request to conduct experimentation on traffic calming measures. Committee Member Tong seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Discussion Items

Agenda Item 15-13: Use of CMS to Promote Voter Turnout

Alejandro “Alex” Padilla, the California Secretary of State, provided an overview of his background prior to politics, the collaboration between the state and the Department of Transportation and the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), his first legislative proposal that will require continued collaboration and cooperation with the DMV about data sharing with his offices regarding voter registration, and the proposal to promote voter turnout via the use of CMS during election times.

The Statute:

- By statute, the use of CMS is selective
- The primary use of CMS is traffic safety

The Nexus:

- There is a nexus between traffic safety and the proposal
 - The Denver, Colorado model
- There is a nexus between not just Election Day awareness, but more specifically to drivers as it pertains to where to vote or where to drop off ballots
 - 7 million eligible Californians are not registered to vote
 - Last November’s election had a record low turnout

- Surveys indicate voters did not know the location of their polling place or had difficulty locating their polling place
- On Election Day, there is a spike in interest but insufficient information or ineffective ways of communicating with potential voters

The Voting Center Model:

- The existing polling place model will be replaced with a voting center model in the future
- Public information as to this shift will be important for successful implementation and transition from the familiar polling place model to the voting center model
- Increasing numbers of voters choose to participate by a vote-by-mail ballot, but continue to drop them off in person at the polling place
- Voting centers offer options of where to vote throughout the jurisdiction so voters are not tied to one polling place
- Voting centers and drop-off locations are open one to two weeks leading up to Election Day

Secretary of State Padilla stated the foundation of the safety nexus between traffic safety measures and the convenience of dropping off ballots and participating in elections is the implementation of ballot drop-off voting centers with coning and signage leading up to the locations where county employees receive ballots at various locations throughout the county.

There is a clear and a strong nexus between using the CMS for destination guidance and special event applications associated with traffic control or conditions, and it falls within the scope of the permitted uses of CMS.

Secretary of State Padilla suggested the CMS show the date of the Election Day and the hours of the voting centers, or something like “Ballot drop-off next exit.” He requested the support of the CTCDC and the collaboration of all the necessary departments and agencies to pilot this at a minimum and do all the necessary research to provide data that is working, safe, and helpful to motorists, voters, and the election experience overall.

Committee Member Questions:

Committee Member Marshall asked if this proposal would still apply if the concept of voting centers does not pass legislation. Secretary of State Padilla stated it is not contingent upon the status of current or future legislation.

Committee Member Walter spoke in support of voting centers and the use of fabric signs to direct traffic to them. The use of CMS on freeways may be less effective than hoped for because highway traffic is going city to city or work to home and not seeking an exit to a voting center. Local street signs can be up longer and will be more effective. Secretary of State Padilla stated further research and a pilot program may be necessary to give the data on whether this makes a difference or not, both from a safety standpoint as well as a voter participation standpoint. He stated the use of CMS or local fabric signs is not an either/or approach, because daily destinations often require highway travel. He suggested a comprehensive approach of using what is appropriate on both highways and surface streets.

Committee Member Winter concurred that vote-by-mail voters often go in-person to polling places to drop off ballots and that provisional voters frequent polling places by their places of work. He spoke in support of the voting center idea and drop boxes, as it will be a convenience for voters. He agreed that local temporary signs on surface streets make sense from a traffic flow perspective.

Committee Member Jones agreed with using CMS for concise reminders that Election Day is coming up or directing voters to a website. He stated space is limited on most CMS.

Secretary of State Padilla stated his proposal draws a clear and direct nexus between safety and the destination guidance that is one of the recognized uses of CMS. He suggested beginning on a pilot basis where the necessary research can be done and brought back for consideration of a more broad-based application.

Committee Member Tong agreed that local street signs may be more effective in directing voters to voting centers. He asked how many voting centers and voters are anticipated. Secretary of State Padilla stated the numbers vary and fluctuate with the type of election. A presidential election brings in more voters, which would necessitate additional voting centers.

The direction signage is not always visible if voters are on the wrong street or around the corner. That is why the signage both on the highway and the street goes hand in hand. The CMS can direct voters to get off at the next exit. Once off the highway, the local street signs can direct the traffic from there. When considering possible locations for voting centers, proximity to a highway and a CMS could be one of those considerations.

Public Comment:

Chair Bahadori stated Mr. Ralph Herman emailed his public comment encouraging the Committee not to support the proposal.

Jill LaVine, of the Registrar of Voters for Sacramento County and the Legislative Chair of the California Association of Clerks and Election Officials, stated the proposal is a part of Assembly Bill 400 and is another tool in an effort to get information out to voters because they do not always read the mailings. The most popular polling places are ones by a highway. The CMS would be a good tool for voters to remind them that it is Election Day and to let them know where the drop-off sites or voting centers are.

Mindy Romero, Ph.D., the Director of the California Civic Engagement Project at UC Davis, stated UC Davis did a study in 2012 on the use of vote-by-mail ballots in California. She agreed that many vote-by-mail ballots are dropped off at polling places and that civic electoral participation in California is at a crisis with record low turnouts for the last two elections. She stated the need for innovative approaches, such as today's proposal, to positively impact voter turnout in California.

Dr. Romero cited a Fordham University study that looked at voter information signs, such as "vote tomorrow," carried by volunteers at high-traffic intersections adjacent to polling place locations that increased voter turnout by 3.5 percent. She stated signage in general around election time has a positive impact on voter turnout. Research shows that individuals do not vote because they do not have access to information. Something like a CMS will create access and reach voters from a wide demographic cut. This is an innovative proposal that could have a dramatic effect on voter turnout.

Committee Member Discussion:

Committee Member Marshall stated the question is the appropriateness of the use of the public highway system as one of the tools to increase voter turnout. Defining it as temporary “destination guidance” makes it an appropriate function of the highway system and the CMS.

Chair Bahadori agreed but cautioned that there are many good and noble social causes and the public highway system cannot promote them all.

Committee Member Jones stated the need for increased traffic management when sending motorists to one location and cautioned that it may cause unanticipated traffic congestion. He used the Del Mar Racetrack and their million-dollar traffic-control plan as an example.

Vice Chair Greenwood stated the message to encourage people to vote is useful to everyone and it is appropriate to explore this idea and find the right way to do it.

Committee Member Walter stated traffic control plans developed for special events is another aspect of the process which should be explored and thoroughly analyzed.

Committee Member Ciccarelli suggested going back to 1A.02, Principles of Traffic Control Devices, for perspective. The effect of a traffic control device should meet five requirements:

- Fulfill a need for traffic control – the voting location message fulfills the need to direct people to a location.
- Command attention – the more concise the message of a CMS, the better it would command attention.
- Convey a clear, simple meaning – the display should be simple and concise.
- Command respect from road users – every sign should command respect.
- Give adequate time for proper response – depends on the traffic control message being displayed.
- Sign proliferation is a sixth consideration with the CMS. Too many signs with differing levels of urgency would lower motorist attention to the urgent messages.

Chair Bahadori stated that is an ongoing debate. He stated his opinion that, if there is nothing important to display on the CMS, nothing should be displayed. If the CMS is usually dark, when a message is displayed, it attracts attention as something of importance and is more effective.

Agenda Item 15-14: Copyright State Highway Shields and Markers

Don Howe, the Chief of the Signs Branch of the Caltrans Office of Traffic Engineering, discussed the differences between state highway shields and route markers, what the CA MUTCD states about copyrights, the pros and cons of copyrighting the shields and markers, and whether Caltrans should charge a fee for the use of the images. He asked Committee Members whether or not the state highway shields, markers, or their images can or should be copyrighted.

Committee Member Walter asked what the concern was to copyright the signs, what other states copyright their signs, and how would it be monitored. Mr. Howe stated the concern is the commercial use of the route shield that possibly gives the wrong impression to the public about endorsement. Also, no other states copyright their signs, but the FHWA recently addressed the

copyright of traffic control devices, and the legal division would need to look into how it would be monitored. He stated the need to limit the use of the state route shield and marker for their intended use.

Chair Bahadori stated the commercial souvenirs have been around for decades and do not diminish the effectiveness of the marker. He asked if there is a need for additional regulations when there is no problem to solve.

Committee Member Marshall agreed that it will create a problem where there is none.

Committee Member Jones stated the souvenirs are a branding thing; they do not negatively impact the roadway.

Public Comment:

Massoud Saberian, a Traffic Engineer from the city of Santa Rosa, stated the California shield is similar to the shield in many states. Copyrighting it in one state may interfere with other states' shields.

8. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on September 3, 2015, at Caltrans District 11, 4050 Taylor Street, San Diego, California.

9. Adjourn

MOTION: Committee Member Marshall moved to adjourn the June 4, 2015, California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting. Committee Member Jones seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Bahadori adjourned the meeting at 12:42 p.m.